1. The Manager, Chief Court.
2. The Press Superintendent.
3. The Devaswam Inspector.
4. The Division Inspector of Police.
5. The Head clerks of the Departmental Heads.
6. The Head clerks of the Huzur Office.
7. The Huzur Chief Superintendent.
8. The Auditor of the Comptroller's Office.
9. The District Registrar.
10. The Superintendent of Stamps.
11. The Superintendent of Anchal.

(b) the present maximum pay of the above posts;

(c) how many times were the pay of each of the above posts revised since the Sub-Magistrate's pay was fixed at Rs. 150?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a), (b) and (c) The information so far collected is appended. (*Appendix V*).

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—May I know the year when the pay of the Magistrates was fixed at 250 ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I want notice. It is a few years back, in 1095 or 1096.

Revenue officer and Parvathiam—Kattakampal Village—allegation against—enquiry into.

447. **Mr. Paul Mampilli.**—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

1. whether a petition has been received by the Diwan dated the 21st of Mithunam 1108, from a tax-payer of Kattakampal village, Talappalli Taluk, alleging certain acts of official misconduct on the part of the Parvathiam of Kattakampal village;

2. if he has, what are the allegations contained in the said petition against the Revenue Officer and Parvathiam respectively;

3. whether the petitioner has stated therein that he is prepared to adduce evidence and convince the Diwan or the Revenue authorities that the allegations he has made in the petition are substantially true;

4. whether the Diwan has ordered to conduct an official enquiry into the matter, affording opportunities to the petitioner to prove his case;

5. if he has not, why;

6. whether he has taken any action on the said petition; and if so, what action;

7. whether a copy of this petition will be printed and placed on the table;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

8. whether the Government have any objection in the matter of conducting an open enquiry in this matter?

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—1. Yes.

2. A copy of the petition is appended. (*Appendix VI*).

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Does not arise in view of the answer given to sub-division (4) above.

6. An enquiry has been ordered.

7. Please see answer to sub-division (2) above.

8. No. Government have already enquired.

Officers that travelled outside Cochin—allowances drawn.

448. **Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.**—Will the Government be pleased to place on the able a list of officers who travelled outside Cochin in 1108, the amounts of allowances drawn by them and the nature of the work done by them?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—A statement containing the available information is appended. (*Appendix VII*).

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Has not the Diwan travelled outside Cochin State in 1108?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes, he has.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is he not an officer?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—May I know why his name is not included?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—It could have been included. It is an omission.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Did he draw any travelling allowance when he went outside Cochin?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes, he draws T. A.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Why was his name not included?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I said that it was an omission.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Will the Government kindly include his name also?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—'Went to Karukutty for the inspection of the railway bridges'—may I know whether our Government officers have any right to inspect railway bridges?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I do not know. Ordinarily railway bridges are not inspected. I do not know whether there

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

APPENDIX VI.

Petition dated 21st Mithunam 1108 from Pulikottil Ittikuru Ittoop, Kattakampal village, Talappalli Taluk.

The humble petition of Pulikottil Ittikuru Ittoop, Kattakampal village, Talappalli Taluk showeth.—

1. That the petitioner is the purchaser of 76 cents of land in survey No. 640/1 of Kattakampal village, Talappalli Taluk, himself having bid the said plot of land at public auction conducted by Government in the year 1107 and that the said sale having been confirmed in his favour, he became entitled to get possession of the entire 76 cents of land on 21st Thulam 1107.

2. Of this plot of 76 cents of kole Nilam yielding puncha crops, the petitioner has been actually given possession of only 50 cents and that in spite of repeated requests he has not yet been put in possession of the remaining portion of the said plot of land.

3. That certain subordinate officers of the Land Revenue Department, especially the Parvathyam of Kattakampal village are responsible to a great extent in obstructing the delivery of possession of this remaining portion of the land, themselves having joined hands with the Jenmies who have illegally encroached into the said portion of land and who still retain possession of the same.

4. That in spite of the Memo L. Dis. 15260/07, Revenue Department, issued from the office of the Diwan of Cochin, directing the Revenue authorities to point out to the petitioner, the exact boundaries of the field they (the Revenue authorities) have not done anything of the kind up till now.

5. That over and above the injustice thus done to the petitioner, he has lately been subject to heavy financial loss also besides much personal humiliation, by taking steps against him under the Land Revenue Recovery Regulation and reaping the harvest of the crop raised in the said 50 cents of land which he has given on pattom to one Kunnathvalappil Saithu Muhamed.

6. That there is no justification of any kind for such an action on the part of the Department and it has been brought about by the deliberate and wilful refusal on the part of the Parvathyam of Kattakampal village to give the petitioner proper receipts for the land tax which had actually been received by the said Parvathyam from the petitioner before the due dates.

7. That the said Parvathyam is a personal enemy of the petitioner and that he (the petitioner) is prepared to adduce evidence and to prove to the entire satisfaction of the Diwan that he has not made any default whatever, and that he has always paid the land tax in due time but that the Parvathyam concerned

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

has wilfully and deliberately refused to record payment and to issue formal receipts in order to make it appear that the petitioner is a defaulter;

8. That the personal grudge and animosity felt by the said Parvathyam did not stop there and therefore in furtherence of his object he subsequently persuaded the Revenue Inspector also to refuse to accept the whole amount of the so-called defaulted tax which was tendered to him first by the petitioner under protest and afterwards by the pattomdar, when the Revenue Inspector went to the spot to the effect the reaping of the harvest.

9. That the Revenue Inspector concerned ought to have accepted the amount tendered and left the field in tact, but instead he acted otherwise under the influence of the Parvathyam, causing thereby very great loss to the petitioner and pattomdar.

10. That by the said unwarranted acts of the subordinate officers of the Revenue Department as pointed out above, the petitioner has been unnecessarily put to very great financial loss.

11. That the petitioner jointly with the Pattomdar therefore submitted a petition to the Head of the Revenue Department as early as the 4th of Edavam 1108, pointing out in detail all the circumstances that had led to the reaping of the harvest and the loss consequently sustained by the petitioners and praying to conduct an enquiry into the allegations contained in the petition; but unfortunately the petition was dismissed without making any such enquiry and without assigning any reason.

12. That the petitioner is therefore very much aggrieved on that account and hence it is his most humble prayer that the Diwan may be pleased to order an enquiry into the conduct of the Revenue Officers concerned;

13. That the petitioner may kindly be given an opportunity to adduce evidence and convince the authorities concerned that he has not made any default in the payment of land taxes etc., that his conduct was above blame, that the allegations he has made against certain subordinate officers of the Department are absolutely true and that they ought to be ordered to make good the loss sustained by the petitioner.

The petitioner therefore most humbly requests that the Diwan may be pleased to order to conduct an enquiry into the several allegations detailed out in the petition submitted to the Diwan Peishkar by the petitioner and the Pattomdar on 4th Edavam 1108 and to kindly redress the petitioner's grievances.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly